

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/776,094	02/10/2004	Stephen Ritland	4510-1-DIV 2357	
22442	7590 10/05/2006 ·		EXAMINER	
SHERIDAN ROSS PC		PHILOGENE, PEDRO		
1560 BROAI SUITE 1200	DWAY		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
DENVER, C	O 80202		3733	
·		DATE MAILED: 10/05/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

NIT	
1/1/	

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/776,094	RITLAND, STEPHEN			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Pedro Philogene	3733			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 Fe	bruarv 2004.				
<u> </u>	action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	ce except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the merits is			
closed in accordance with the practice under E					
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/30/04,7/16/04, 2/15/05, 5/5/05/05	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail De 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate			

Art Unit: 3733

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-28 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 38-45 of U.S. Patent No. 6,736,816.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because it is clear that all the elements of claims 1-28 are to be found in claims 38-45. The difference between claims 1-28 of the application and claims 38-45 of the patent lies in the fact that the patent claims include many more elements and are thus much more specific. Thus, the invention of claims 38-45 of the patent is in effect a "species" of the "generic" invention of claims 1-28. It has been held that the generic invention is "anticipated" by the "species". See In re Goodman, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Since claims of the application are anticipated by the claims of the patent, they are not patentably distinct.

Art Unit: 3733

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mullane (6,050,997).

With respect to claims 1,10, 16,22, Mullane discloses an attachment device adapted for use with a tension link, the tension link including a tension link head (40) and shaft (42), the device comprising a shank having first and second ends (24,26,28), the first end having a securing mechanism (26) and the second end comprises at least a first expansion slot (as best seen in 24) a hollow core (34) and a central aperture (36), wherein the second end is deformable (because of the slot in 24) to accommodate the insertion of the tension link head through the central aperture and into the hollow core, and wherein the tension link head is retained within the hollow core after insertion therein, as set forth in column 6, lines 59-67; the means (44,46) for deforming, as best seen in FIGS. 3, 4B; the distal including means (120) for securing a receptacle (18) with a tension link cavity; as best seen in FIGS.14,16.

Application/Control Number: 10/776,094

Art Unit: 3733

With respect to claims 2-7,11-15, 17-21,23-28, Mullane discloses all the limitations, as set forth in column 6, lines 35-67, column 7, lines 1-10, lines 22-42, column 9, lines 42-62; and as best seen in FIGs.1-16.

With respect to the method claims 8,9, the method steps, as set forth, would have been inherently carried out in the operation of the device, as set forth above.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

5,800,435	9-1998	Errico et al.
5,628,740	5-1997	Mullane
6,554,831	4-2003	Rivard et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pedro Philogene whose telephone number is (571) 272-4716. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 6:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eduardo Robert can be reached on (571) 272 - 4719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Pedro Philogene September 28, 2006

PEDRO PHILOGENE PRIMARY EXAMINER